



An  
Coimisiún  
Pleanála

# Inspector's Report

**PL-500960-SD-26**

---

<b>Development</b>	The demolition of existing single-storey porch and construction of new porch.
<b>Location</b>	No. 1 Taylor's Lane, Rathfarnham, Dublin 16, D16T0V6
<b>Planning Authority</b>	South Dublin County Council.
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	SD25B/0700W.
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	Pryemslaw Gosik..
<b>Type of Application</b>	Permission.
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Grant permission with Conditions.
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	First Party
<b>Appellant(s)</b>	Pryemslaw Gosik.
<b>Observer(s)</b>	None.
<b>Date of Site Inspection</b>	18/04/26.
<b>Inspector</b>	Anthony Abbott King

## 1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. Taylor's Lane is a stretch of the R113 principally located between Ballyboden Road and the R822.
- 1.2. Taylor's Lane is characterised by an eclectic building stock with boundary walls and planted setbacks defining the broad main carriageway.
- 1.3. No. 1 Taylor's Lane is located on the northside of Taylor's Lane. The streetscape at the location of the appeal site is characterised by two-storey suburban housing both detached and semi-detached.
- 1.4. The semi-detached and detached houses in the streetscape follow an indicative building line and are setback from the street with front gardens.
- 1.5. No. 1 Taylor's Lane is a detached two-storey house, which is gable fronted to the street. There are four similar in appearance detached houses in the wider streetscape.
- 1.6. The site area is given as 0.037 hectares.

## 2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The demolition of existing single-storey porch and construction of new enlarged flat roofed porch to front and all associated works.

## 3.0 Planning Authority Decision

### 3.1. Decision

Grant permission subject to 3 conditions.

#### 3.1.1. Conditions

Condition 2 is relevant:

#### *Amendments*

*Prior to the commencement of development the applicant, owner or developer shall submit the following for the written agreement of the Planning Authority: Revised plans*

*that demonstrate the front extension reduced in depth to project a maximum of 1.5m in depth from the main front building line of the subject dwelling, in accordance with the SDCC House Extension Design Guide (2025).*

**REASON:** *In the interests of orderly development, and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.*

### **3.2. Planning Authority Reports**

#### **3.2.1. Planning Reports**

The decision of the CEO of South Dublin County Council reflects the recommendation of the planning case officer.

#### **3.2.2. Other Technical Reports**

No objection.

### **3.3. Third Party Observations**

There are no third-party submissions on file.

## **4.0 Planning History**

4.1. There is no recent relevant planning history.

## **5.0 Policy Context**

### **5.1. Development Plan**

The local policy framework is provided by the South Dublin County Council (SDCC) Development Plan 2022-2028. The relevant policies and objectives are set-out below:

- Zoning

The relevant land-use zoning objective is “RES”: *'To protect and/or improve residential amenity.'*

- Urban Consolidation

Policy H14 (Residential Extensions) Objective 1 is relevant and states:

*To favourably consider proposals to extend existing dwellings subject to the protection of residential and visual amenities and compliance with the standards set out in Chapter 12: Implementation and Monitoring and the guidance set out in the South Dublin County Council House Extension Design Guide, 2010 (or any superseding guidelines).*

- Residential Extensions

Section 12.6 (Housing / Residential Development) is relevant. Paragraph “Extensions” states:

*The design of residential extensions should have regard to the permitted pattern of development in the immediate area alongside the South Dublin County Council House Extension Guide (2010) or any superseding standards.*

- Other relevant policy documents

The South Dublin County Council (SDCC) House Extension Design Guide (2025).

Section 3.1.7 Built Form Principle (BFP) 1 (All Extensions & Alterations to Houses) is relevant and states:

- *Respects the appearance and character of the house and character of the house and subject streetscape / local area.*
- *Does not read as overly dominate relative to existing structure by reason of scale or position.*
- *Provide comfortable internal space and useful outside space.*
- *Incorporate energy efficient measures where possible.*
- *Do not adversely impact on adjoining properties by way of significant overbearing visual appearance.*
- *Does not result in significantly increased levels of overshadowing of adjacent properties.*
- *Does not directly overlook / result in significantly increased levels of overlooking of adjacent properties. Where a new window could result in overlooking or loss of*

*privacy to neighbouring properties, consider alternative design solutions such as repositioning the window or use of a high level window (cill level 1.7m), angled window or obscure glazing.*

- *Consideration of external finishes, such as use of light-coloured materials on elevations adjacent to neighbouring properties.*
- *Consideration of remaining private open space.*

Section 3.2 (Front Extensions) is relevant. Section 3.2.1 (General Considerations) *inter alia* states:

*Modest ground floor front extensions that do not dominate the front elevation of a house are generally acceptable, where sufficient space remains for the setting of the house within the streetscape and for the maintenance of no. 1 in-curtilage car parking space (depth of 6 metres between the front boundary of the site and front building line of the house). Front extensions may include a porch, front door canopy or bay window extension (or combination of such elements) or a single or two storey front extension. Larger ground floor front extension and first floor front extensions may be considered in the case of larger houses or larger plots, which have more capacity to accommodate change without serious, adverse effects on neighbouring properties or where these extensions have less visual impact on the street by reason of building set-back or screening. Regard will be given to strong building lines and streetscape coherence.....*

Section 3.2.2 Built Form principle (BFP) 2 – Front Extensions is relevant and states:

- *Should not dominate the front elevation of the house.*
- *Should not exceed 1.5 metres in depth where there is a regular / uniform front building line along the street.*
- *Should retain a driveway depth of 6 metres.*
- *Should complement the design and materials used in the main house, unless design rationale for alternative materials is demonstrated.*
- *Roof profile of two storey front extension should tie in with that of the main house, unless design rationale for alternative profile is demonstrated.*
- *Roof profile of ground floor front extension to a bungalow / dormer bungalow should be carefully considered relative to the eaves level of the house.*

## 5.2. Relevant National or Regional Policy / Ministerial Guidelines

- The Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024).
- The Development Management Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2007).

## 6.0 EIA Screening

6.1. The proposed development is not a class for the purposes of EIA as per the classes of development set out in Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended. No mandatory requirement for EIA therefore arises and there is also no requirement for a screening determination.

## 7.0 The Appeal

### 7.1. Grounds of Appeal

The grounds of appeal are summarised below:

- The appellant welcomes the grant of planning permission. This appeal is solely against Condition number 2 of the notification to grant planning permission, which requires the depth of the proposed replacement porch to be restricted to 1.5m.
- The appellant requests the Commission to reconsider the imposition of the subject condition and grant permission for the porch depth as originally proposed. It is claimed that the dimensions of the porch are principally determined by the functional and safety considerations and that a deeper front porch would significantly improve accessibility to the house for a person with reduced mobility.
- A family member who frequently visits the house suffers from multiple sclerosis and uses a walking frame for mobility. The dimension of the porch as revised to the restricted depth of 1.5m would not provide sufficient space for safe and comfortable manoeuvring with the walking aid.
- It is claimed that the subject Condition number 2 is unnecessary and unreasonable, as the proposed 3m depth does not interfere with on-site parking

provision or driveway requirements. The area between the extension and the plot boundary remains a green planted area.

- The existing driveway and on-site parking layout are fully preserved with no reduction in the 6m parking depth.
- It is claimed that the extension would have minimal visual impact on the streetscape due to its modest scale, flat roof, and location forward of a planted green area. The property is a detached dwelling and the proposed increase in depth would not have a negative impact on adjacent properties or the overall character of the area.
- The neighbouring property features a porch that is 2500mm in depth. This demonstrates that the proposed porch is consistent with the existing built form in the vicinity and would not introduce any incongruous element.
- The SDCC Extension Design Guide (2025) permits exceptions for sites with capacity to accommodate change without serious adverse effects on the receiving environment.
- The appellant states that the estate has varied front building lines (as per the original 2000 layout) so that no strict uniformity exists to justify a rigid 1.5m cap. Furthermore, the site is characterised by mature planting and low visual prominence qualifying as a site that can accommodate change.
- The condition applies an overly rigid interpretation of the SDCC House Extension Design Guide (2025) without regard to site specific merits and guideline exceptions.
- It is claimed that Condition number 2 would not protect residential amenities or prevent any undesirable pattern for future development. The extension has no overlooking, overshadowing or overbearing effects on neighbouring properties due to its single storey height and setback.
- The front porch serves a practical purpose within the dwellinghouse acting as temporary space for bicycle storage.
- The granting of the extension without a reduction in depth would not set an undesirable precedent, as planning assessments are site specific.

## 7.2. **Planning Authority Response**

The Planning Authority confirms its decision. The issues raised in the appeal have been covered in the Chief Executive Order.

## 7.3. **Observations**

None.

## 8.0 **Assessment**

8.1. This is a first-party appeal against Condition number 2 attached to the notification of decision of South Dublin County Council (SDCC) to grant permission for the proposed development subject to 3 number conditions. The appeal relates to Condition number 2 attached to the permission.

8.2. I note that no other appeal or observation has been received, and consider that the de novo assessment of the proposed development is not warranted in this instance. I am satisfied that that the proposal is otherwise in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area. As such and in accordance with Section 139 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, the assessment of the proposed development will be confined to the conditions subject to appeal.

8.3. I have examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeal, the reports of the local authority, and having inspected the site, and having regard to the relevant planning policies and guidance.

8.4. I consider that the only planning matter at issue in this case is Condition 2 of the notification of decision to grant planning permission and that no other planning matters need to be considered by the Commission. Condition 2 the subject of this appeal is assessed below.

### 8.5. *Condition no. 2*

Condition number 2 provides for the reduction in the depth of the front extension to a maximum projection of 1.5m in depth from the main front building line of the subject dwelling.

8.6. The rationale for the reduction in the depth of the front single-storey porch is to comply with the provisions of the South Dublin County Council (SDCC) House Extension Design Guide (2025).

8.7. The reason for the attachment of the subject condition is give in the interests of orderly development and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

8.8. The appellant *inter alia* claims that Condition number 2 applies an overly rigid interpretation of the SDCC House Extension Design Guide (2025) without regard to site specific merits and guideline exceptions. I interrogate this matter below.

8.9. *Principle of development*

The appeal site is zoned Objective “RES” of the South Dublin County Development Plan 2022-2028, which seeks to protect and/or improve residential amenity. Residential is a permitted land use.

8.10. The South Dublin County Development Plan 2022-2028 Section 12.6 (Housing / Residential Development) *inter alia* states the design of residential extensions should have regard to the permitted pattern of development in the immediate area alongside the South Dublin County Council House Extension Guide (2010) or any superseding standards.

8.11. The relevant guidance is provided by the South Dublin County Council (SDCC) House Extension Design Guide (2025).

8.12. I consider that the guidance provided in Section 3.1.7 Built Form Principle (BFP) 1 (All Extensions & Alterations to Houses) and Section 3.2 (Front Extensions) is relevant to this assessment.

8.13. *SDCC House Extension Design Guide (2025)*

Section 3.2.1 (General Considerations) *inter alia* states that front extensions may include a porch, front door canopy or bay window extension (or combination of such elements) or a single or two storey front extension.

8.14. Section 3.2.2 2 Built Form principle (BFP) 2 – Front Extensions provides specific guidance criteria in the matter of the built form of a front extension. I assess compliance with the criteria below.

- 8.15. The first criteria is that the front extension, in the instance of the development under appeal a single-storey porch, should not dominate the front elevation of the house.
- 8.16. There is an existing glazed single-storey porch to the front of the property. The existing front porch has a depth of 117mm and a width of 2644mm. The existing porch has a pitched style roof structure. The porch has glazed walls and roof and is transparent.
- 8.17. The new single-storey replacement porch would have a footprint of 8.12 sqm measuring a depth of 2900mm and a width of 2800mm. The porch would be a blockwork construction and would have a finished roof height of 2920mm.
- 8.18. I note the maximum dept of the porch at roof level is 2977mm given the projection of the standing seam zinc / aluminium profiled flat roof.
- 8.19. Notwithstanding that the replacement porch is larger than the existing porch and would have a greater solid to void ratio, I do not consider on balance that the proposed porch would have an adverse visual impact or would dominant the existing dwelling house on site.
- 8.20. The second criteria is that the front extension should not exceed 1.5 metres in depth where there is a regular / uniform front building line along the street. The replacement front porch would have a dept of 2900mm, which would exceed the maximum permitted depth
- 8.21. The subject dwelling house in one of four detached dwelling houses of similar form and appearance within a broader streetscape of predominantly semi-detached houses.
- 8.22. The adjoining houses to the east and west of the appeal site do not generally have projecting front porches.
- 8.23. I note that the receiving streetscape is characterised by a mixed building stock of predominantly semi-detached and detached houses. However, I acknowledge that the building line is uniform.
- 8.24. However, I consider that the streetscape is characterised by an eclectic house typology.

- 8.25. I acknowledge that the guidance requires that the front extension should not exceed 1.5 metres in depth . However, I do not consider the wording of the paragraph absolute. I interrogate this matter further below.
- 8.26. It is claimed that the dimensions of the proposed porch are principally determined by the functional and safety considerations and that a deeper front porch would significantly improve accessibility to the house for a person with reduced mobility.
- 8.27. I consider that Section 3.2.1 (General Considerations) *inter alia* provides a discretion in terms of larger ground floor front extension the subject of this appeal.
- 8.28. The overall Guidance advises that larger ground floor front extensions and first floor front extensions may be considered in the case of larger houses or larger plots, which have more capacity to accommodate change without serious, adverse effects on neighbouring properties or where these extensions have less visual impact on the street by reason of building set-back or screening.
- 8.29. The appellant claims that the extension would have minimal visual impact on the streetscape due to its modest scale, flat roof, and location forward of a planted green area.
- 8.30. The appeal site accommodates a 2-storey detached property located within a mature setting. The house is setback from the streetscape on a detached residential plot reflecting the pattern of development in the area, which is characterised by semi-detached and detached houses with front and rear gardens.
- 8.31. Furthermore, the Guidance *inter alia* states modest ground floor front extensions that do not dominate the front elevation of a house are generally acceptable, where sufficient space remains for the setting of the house within the streetscape and for the maintenance of no. 1 in-curtilage car parking space (depth of 6 metres between the front boundary of the site and front building line of the house).
- 8.32. I do not consider that the front extension would dominate the front elevation of a house, as discussed above. I further consider that sufficient space remains for the setting of the house within the streetscape.
- 8.33. Finally, I note that no. 4 Taylor's Lane a detached property of similar form and appearance to the east of the appeal site exhibits a pitched-roof single-storey front extension constructed across the width of the front façade. The covered porch

element of the front extension in a similar location to the proposed porch to no. 1 Taylor's Lane projects significantly forward of the substantive depth of the front extension (approximately 2.5m).

- 8.34. I conclude that the proposed front replacement porch would not have an adverse visual impact on the existing dwelling house itself or on the receiving streetscape.
- 8.35. The third criteria requires that a driveway depth of 6m should be retained.
- 8.36. The appellant states that the subject Condition number 2 is unnecessary and unreasonable, as the proposed 3m depth does not interfere with on-site parking provision or driveway requirements.
- 8.37. I agree with the appellant that Condition number 2 is unnecessary in order to regulate the existing in-curtilage parking provision given the location of the porch at the eastern extremity of the front elevation.
- 8.38. The porch footprint would not extend into the 6m zone between the southern elevation of the house and the front boundary of the residential plot in the location of the existing driveway and parking area at the western extremity of the plot.
- 8.39. However, I note that the front garden depth is approximately 8.5m and the separation of the proposed porch projection (3m) from the front boundary would be less than 6m (5474mm).
- 8.40. I conclude on balance that the replacement porch with a depth of 3m would satisfy the criterion in principle as the existing hardstanding area comprising the in-curtilage driveway and parking provision located to the west of the plot would not be adversely impacted by the proposal.
- 8.41. The fourth criteria requires the extension should complement the design and materials used in the main house, unless design rationale for alternative materials is demonstrated.
- 8.42. The replacement porch would exhibit a standing seam zinc / aluminium profiled asphalt flat roof that would extend marginally beyond the supporting walls..
- 8.43. The entrance door would be located in the side elevation (West) and an associated corner window would articulate the southwest corner of the porch extending along the front elevation (south). A Velux rooflight is proposed in the flat roof of the porch.

- 8.44. The flat metal roof would be anthracite in colour and the porch elevations would have a render finish.
- 8.45. I consider that the material finish would harmonise with the existing front elevation while exhibiting a contemporary design.
- 8.46. The fifth criteria is not relevant as it relates solely to a two-storey front extension.
- 8.47. The sixth criteria is also not relevant as it relates to the ground floor extension of a bungalow.
- 8.48. Finally, the appellant claims that Condition number 2 would not protect residential amenities or prevent any undesirable pattern for future development. I agree with the appellant.
- 8.49. I agree with the appellant that the replacement porch extension has no overlooking, overshadowing or overbearing effects on neighbouring properties due to its single storey height and setback.
- 8.50. Furthermore, I note that the extension incorporates energy efficient measures, including triple glazing.
- 8.51. I conclude that the proposed replacement porch would in general be consistent with Section 3.1.7 Built Form Principle (BFP) 1 (All Extensions & Alterations to Houses) and Section 3.2 (Front Extensions) of the SDCC House Extension Design Guidelines (2025).
- 8.52. Development Management Guidelines  
Section 7.3 (Basic Criteria for Conditions) of the Development Management Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2007), requires planning conditions to be necessary, relevant to the development to be permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable.
- 8.53. I do not consider Condition number 2 to be either necessary or reasonable, as required by the Development Management Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2007) given that the proposed porch would in general satisfy the overall requirements of Section 3.2 (Front Extension) of the SDCC House Extension Design Guidelines (2025) without a restriction in the depth of the porch to 1.5m.

## 9.0 AA Screening

I have considered the proposed development in-light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended).

The subject site is located within an established suburban area and is connected to piped services and is not immediate to a European Site. The proposed development comprises minor works to the front façade of an existing dwellinghouse.

No significant nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site given the small-scale nature of the development.

I conclude that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.

Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

## 10.0 Water Framework Directive

10.1. The site is located in a suburban location. It is not proximate to a visible watercourse.

The development comprises a replacement front porch.

No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

I have assessed the development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.

The reason for this conclusion is the small scale and nature of the development.

I conclude based on objective information, the proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration of any water body (rivers, lakes, groundwaters, transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardise any water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

## **11.0 Recommendation**

Having regard to the nature of the condition the subject of the appeal, the Commission is satisfied that the determination by the Commission of the relevant application as if it had been made to it in the first instance would not be warranted and, based on the reasons and considerations set out below, directs the said Council under subsection (1) of section 139 of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 to remove condition number 2 and the reason therefor.

## **12.0 Reasons and Considerations**

Having regard to the residential land use zoning for the site, and to the pattern of development in the area, it is considered that the proposed replacement porch, by reason of its single-storey height, limited footprint, nature and design, and its location to the front of a detached dwellinghouse within a mature setting and with respect to adjoining properties, would on balance not detract from the character of the dwelling and would not seriously injure the amenities of the area or of property in the vicinity by reason of a depreciation in visual and / or residential amenity. The planning authority's Condition 2 requiring the reduction in the depth of the proposed porch is, therefore, not warranted.

I confirm that this report represents my professional planning assessment, judgement and opinion on the matter assigned to me and that no person has influenced or sought to influence me, directly or indirectly, following my professional assessment and recommendation set out in my report in an improper or inappropriate way.

---

Anthony Abbott King  
Planning Inspector

29 April 2026

## Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

<b>Case Reference</b>	PL-500960-SD-26
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	Replacement front porch
<b>Development Address</b>	No. 1 Taylor's Lane, Rathfarnham, Dublin 16.
<b>IN ALL CASES CHECK BOX / OR LEAVE BLANK</b>	
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'Project' for the purposes of EIA?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q.2
	<input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
(For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means:  - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes,  - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	
<b>2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1.  <b>EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.</b>	<b>State the Class here</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	

<b>3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994.  <b>No Screening required.</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.  <b>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</b>	<b>State the Class and state the relevant threshold</b> N/A
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.  <b>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)</b>  <b>OR</b>  <b>If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</b>	<b>State the Class and state the relevant threshold</b> N/A
<b>4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?</b>	
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)</b>
No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)</b>

Inspector: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_